



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

day (Ohio), 126 Fed. Rep. 257. And where a resident of a state sold lands in another state and took notes therefor payable in the latter state and left there for collection they were held not taxable in the former state. *Wilcox v. Ellis*, 14 Kan. 588; *Fisher v. Com. of Rush County*, 19 Kan. 414. See also as to the general extent of the power of the state to tax notes and mortgages, *Buck v. Miller*, 147 Ind. 586, 62 Am. St. Rep. 436; *New Orleans v. Stempel*, 175 U. S. 309; *Comptoir National D'Escompte v. Board of Assessors*, 52 La. Ann. 1319.

PLEDGE—DUTY OF PLEDGEE TO PRESERVE THE VALUE OF COLLATERAL SECURITY.—Appellant borrowed \$192, giving therefor his promissory note, payment of which was secured by a collateral note for \$450, owing, to appellant and secured by a chattel mortgage on a large amount of growing corn. The notes, before maturity, came into the possession of the appellee in the regular course of business. The appellee took the notes with the understanding that appellant's chattel mortgage interest should be cared for and enforced and that appellee, after paying himself from the proceeds, resulting from the enforcement of the chattel mortgage, should turn over the remainder to appellant. When the collateral note became due, appellee failed to enforce the chattel mortgage which secured it and thereby the security was lost. *Held*, that appellee was bound to use ordinary diligence in the collection of the collateral note. *Scott v. First National Bank* (1904), — I. T. —, 82 S. W. Rep. 751.

The courts, quite generally, hold that when a creditor takes, as collateral security, a note due to his debtor from a third person, the pledgee, being entitled to the possession of the note having a certain ownership therein, must take all reasonable care to make secure the rights of the pledgor. *Farm Inv. Co. v. Wyo. College, etc.*, 10 Wyo. 240, 68 Pac. 561; *Reeves et al. v. Plough*, 41 Ind. 204; *Mt. Vernon Bridge Co. v. Knox County Sav. Bank*, 46 Ohio St. 224, 20 N. E. 339; *Mauck v. Atlanta Trust & Bank Co.*, 113 Ga. 242, 38 S. E. 845. The pledgee, in his exercise of reasonable diligence, must, if necessary to preserve the collateral note, sue the maker thereof; and if by failure to take proper steps, the value of the collateral is lost, the pledgee is liable therefor to the pledgor. *Whitaker v. The Charleston Gas Co.*, 16 W. Va. 717; *Wakeman et al. v. Gowdy*, 10 Bosw. (N. Y.) 208; *Roberts v. Thompson and Clark*, 14 Ohio St. 1, 82 Am. Dec. 465; *Hanna v. Holton*, 78 Pa. St. 384, 21 Am. Rep. 20; *Northwestern Nat. Bank of Aberdeen v. J. Thompson & Sons Mfg. Co.*, 71 Fed. Rep. 113; *Hazard v. Wells*, 2 Abb. N. C. (N. Y.) 444; *Lamberton et al. v. Windom et al.*, 12 Minn. 232, 90 Am. Dec. 301. In a late case, the court held that where a promissory note had been given as collateral security for the payment of a smaller note, made by the pledgor, and the pledgee had failed to demand payment of the collateral note or to give notice of its dishonor, whereby the indorser was discharged, the pledgor could, when sued on his own note, show by way of recoupment, the damages which he had sustained by the pledgee's negligence. *Coleman v. Lewis*, 183 Mass. 485.